



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/234,351	01/20/1999	MARVIN L. WILLIAMS	WILLIAM-2	6210
27964	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
HITT GAINES P.C. P.O. BOX 832570 RICHARDSON, TX 75083			NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/234,351

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMS, MARVIN L.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6,8,9,11-15,17,18,20-24 and 26-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6,8,9,11-15,17,18,20-24 and 26-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed 02/23/2005 to the original application filed 01/20/1999.
2. Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-15, 17-18, 20-24 and 26-51 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 10, 16, 19 and 25 have been canceled. Claims 28-33, 37-39, and 43-48 have been amended. Claims 28, 37 and 43 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities: "a button" (line 3) should probably read "a first button". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-12, 14-18, 20-24, 26-33, 35-39, and 41-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Birrell et al.** (U.S. 6,029,192 – filed 03/1997) in view of **Ozaki et al.** (U.S. 5,991,798 – issued 11/23/1998).

As to independent claim 37:

- a. Birrell teaches an electronic mail program (*e-mail; col.4, lines 21-31*), a method comprising:
- (i) locating hypertext references in a plurality of electronic mail messages (*col.11, lines 54-63*); and
 - (ii) in response to a first command from a user displaying a first web page corresponding to one of the located hypertext references (*col.11, line 59-col.12, lines 13*)
- b. Birrell does not explicitly teach “*in response to a next command issued by the user while the first web page is displayed, wherein the next command does not identify an electronic message or a hypertext reference, displaying a second web page corresponding to another of the located hypertext references that is next in relation to the hypertext reference to the first web page in an order of the located hypertext references predetermined by a preference of the user, without displaying the electronic message in which the hypertext reference to the second web page is located.*”
- c. Ozaki teaches in response to a next command issued by the user while the first web page is displayed, wherein the next command does not identify an electronic

message or a hypertext reference, displaying a second web page corresponding to another of the located hypertext references that is next in relation to the hypertext reference to the first web page in an order of the located hypertext references predetermined by a preference of the user, without displaying the electronic message in which the hypertext reference to the second web page is located (*col.15, lines 50-57 & Fig.21*).

- d. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Ozaki in the system of Birrell because it would have provided the capability for reading information from a WWW server, and displaying the information my using hyper text markup language.

As to dependent claim 38:

- a. Birrell teaches displaying the electronic message (*e.g., messages are normally displayed; col.11, lines 54-63*), but does not explicitly teach “*in response to another command issued by the user while the first web page is displayed, wherein the other command does not identify an electronic message or a hypertext reference, displaying a third web page corresponding to yet another of the located hypertext references that precedes the hypertext reference of the first web page in the order, without displaying the electronic message in which the hypertext reference to the third web page is located.*”
- b. Ozaki teaches in response to another command issued by the user while the first web page is displayed, wherein the other command does not identify an electronic

message or a hypertext reference, displaying a third web page corresponding to yet another of the located hypertext references that precedes the hypertext reference of the first web page in the order, without displaying the electronic message in which the hypertext reference to the third web page is located (*col.15, lines 50-57 & Fig.21*).

- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Ozaki in the system of Birrell because it would have provided the capability for reading information from a WWW server, and displaying the information my using hyper text markup language.

As to dependent claim 39:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 38, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 41:

Birrell teaches in response to displaying the first web page (*col.11, line 59-col.12, lines 13*), deleting the hypertext reference corresponding to the first web page from the order (*col.14, lines 3-4 and col.15, lines 41-43*).

As to dependent claim 42:

Birrell teaches in response to the locating, displaying a list of the electronic mail messages, including displaying in the list each located hypertext reference in association with an identifier of the electronic mail message in which the located hypertext reference is found (*col. 11, line 54-col.12, lines 20*).

As to independent claim 28:

- a. The rejection of independent claim 37 above is incorporated herein in full.
Additionally, claim 37 further recites “a message organizer the order the located hypertext references in an order predetermined by a preference of a user.”
- b. Birrell teaches a message organizer (*col.4, lines 16-19*), but does not explicitly teach “order the located hypertext references in an order predetermined by a preference of a user.”
- c. Ozaki teaches order the located hypertext references in an order predetermined by a preference of a user (*Fig.21*).
- d. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Ozaki in the system of Birrell because it would have provided the capability for reading information from a WWW server, and displaying the information my using hyper text markup language.

As to dependent claim 2:

Birrell teaches the message (*col.4, lines 16-19*) organizer further causes the electronic mail program to display a message field containing the hypertext references and a from field containing the sender associated with each of the hypertext references (*col.8, line 66-col.9, line 2/ col.11, line 54-col.12, line 13*).

As to dependent claim 3:

Birrell teaches the electronic mail messages are each selected from the group consisting of: a direct electronic mail message, and a newsgroup posting (*col.1, lines 33-38*).

As to dependent claim 5:

Birrell teaches the message organizer orders based on the hypertext references and the sender associated with each of the hypertext references (*col.4, lines 16-24 / col. 11, lines 38-53*).

As to dependent claim 6:

Birrell teaches the hypertext references are uniform resource locators (*e.g., URL; col. 12, lines 2-13*).

As to dependent claim 8:

Birrell teaches a browser (*e.g., Web browser; col.11, lines 54-63*) and wherein the message organizer is capable of employing the browser to view information associated with the hypertext references (*col.11, line 54-col.12, lines 13*).

As to dependent claims 11-12 & 14-15:

They include the same limitations as in claims 2-3 & 5-6, and are similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 17-18:

They include the same limitations as in claims 8-9, and are similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 20-24:

They include the same limitations as in claims 2-6, and are similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 26-27:

They include the same limitations as in claims 8-9, and are similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 29:

- a. Ozaki teaches a button displayed along with the first web page whose actuation triggers displaying of the second web page (*col.15, lines 50-57 & Fig.21*).
- b. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Ozaki in the system of Birrell because it would have provided the capability for reading information from a WWW server, and displaying the information my using hyper text markup language.

As to dependent claim 30:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 39, and is similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 31-32:

They include the same limitations as in claim 29-30, and are similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 33:

- a. Ozaki teaches a button displayed along with the first web page whose actuation triggers displaying of the web page corresponding to the hypertext reference that follows the one hypertext reference in the order and a second button displayed along with the first web page whose actuation triggers displaying of the web page

corresponding to the hypertext reference that precedes the one hypertext reference in the order (*col.15, lines 50-57 & Fig.21*)

- b. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Ozaki in the system of Birrell because it would have provided the capability for reading information from a WWW server, and displaying the information my using hyper text markup language.

As to dependent claim 35:

- a. It includes the same limitations as in claim 41, and is similarly rejected the same rationale. Additional, claim 35 further recites “the message organizer.”
- b. Birrell teaches the message organizer (*e.g., organize mail messages; col.4, lines 16-19*).

As to dependent claim 36:

Birrell teaches responsive to the locating, for displaying a list of the electronic mail messages, including displaying in the list each located hypertext reference in association with an identifier of the electronic mail message in which the located hypertext reference is found (*col.11, line 54-col.12, line 13*).

As to independent claim 43:

The rejection of independent claim 37 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Birrell further teaches:

- (i) a message receiver (*the messages were received; col.11, lines 4-38 / the message has been received; col.12, lines 38-44*);

- (ii) a message transmitter (*send a message; col.14, lines 50-54*) coupled to the message receiver;
- (iii) a message composer (*compose begins a new message; col.14, lines 15-33*) coupled to the message transmitter; and
- (iv) a message store (*new messages are stored; col.11, lines 29-38*) coupled to the message composer.

As to dependent claims 44-45:

They include the same limitations as in claims 29-30, and are similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependents claim 46-47:

They include the same limitations as in claims 29-30, and are similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 48-49:

They include the same limitations as in claims 33-34, and are similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 50-51:

They include the same limitations as in claim 35-36, and is similarly rejected the same rationale.

6. Claims 4, 9, 13, 34, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Birrell et al.** in view of **Ozaki et al.** as applied to claims 28 and 37 above, and further in view of **McPhail** (U.S. 6,742,030 – filed 11/1997).

As to dependent claim 4:

- a. Birrell teaches the message organizer (*col.4, lines 16-19*). The combination of Birrell and Ozaki does not explicitly teach “the hypertext references have associated viewing statues, identically marking viewing statuses of identical ones of the hypertext reference.”
- b. McPhail teaches the hypertext references have associated viewing statues, identically marking viewing statuses of identical ones of the hypertext reference (*e.g., those links which have previously been visited can be specifically highlight; col.3, lines 10-14*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from McPhail in the system of Birrell as modified by Ozaki because it would have provided the capability for comparing the contents of a history table to hypertext links that are currently being displayed by the browser.

As to dependent claim 9:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 4, and is similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 13:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 4, and is similarly rejected the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 34:

- a. Birrell teaches responsive to displaying the first web page, all hypertext references corresponding to the first web page in the electronic mail message

(col.11, lines 54-63). The combination of Birrell and Ozaki does not explicitly teach “marking all hypertext references as having been accessed.”

- b. McPhail teaches marking all hypertext references as having been accessed (*e.g., those links which have previously been visited can be specifically highlight; col.3, lines 10-14*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from McPhail in the system of Birrell as modified by Ozaki because it would have provided the capability for comparing the contents of a history table to hypertext links that are currently being displayed by the browser.

As to dependent claim 40:

- a. Birrell teaches in response to displaying the first web page (*col.11, line 59-col.12, lines 13*). The combination of Birrell and Ozaki does not explicitly teach “marking all hypertext references corresponding to the first web page as having been accessed.”
- b. McPhail teaches marking all hypertext references corresponding to the first web page as having been accessed (*e.g., those links which have previously been visited can be specifically highlight; col.3, lines 10-14*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from McPhail in the system of Birrell as modified by Ozaki because it would have provided the capability for

comparing the contents of a history table to hypertext links that are currently being displayed by the browser.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 08/26/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Responsive to arguments set forth in Applicant's arguments, the Examiner has considered and replaced Williams reference with the new references as set forth in the rejection above.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Barrett et al. U.S Patent No. 5,727,129 issued: Mar. 10, 1998

Peercy et al. U.S Patent No. 5,960,429 issued: Sep. 28, 1999

Henning Schulzinn, "World Wide Web: Whence, Whither, What Next?", IEEE Network, 1996, page(s):10-17.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
May 29, 2005

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
May 31, 2005